

## Remarks

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-8 and 17-26 remain pending.

### Statement of Substance of Examiner Interview dated 12/18/08

Applicant would like to sincerely thank Examiner Augustine for his time in discussing this application over the phone with Applicant's attorney Daniel T. McGinnity on 12/18/08.

During this interview, the §102 rejections over Gershony were briefly discussed. In the interest of expediting allowance of the subject application and without conceding the propriety of the rejection, proposed amendments to clarify aspects of the claims were discussed. The Examiner provided helpful input on the proposed claims. The Applicant understood the Examiner as tentatively agreeing that the subject matter of the proposed amendments was sufficient overcome the references of record.

Accordingly, in the interest of expediting allowance of the subject application and without conceding the propriety of the rejection, amendments have been made to the independent claims herein in the spirit of those discussed during the interview. The Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If any issues remain that would prevent the allowance of the application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issues.

### **35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections**

Claims 1-8 and 17-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated U.S. Patent No. 6,549,218 to Gershony et al. (“Gershony”).

Applicant makes no representation that cited references are prior art. This response and any remarks or comments included herein are not intended to be, and are not to be interpreted as, an admission that any cited references are prior art. Applicant reserves the right to dispose of any cited reference under 35 U.S.C. §102 and/or 35 U.S.C. §103, including but not limited to antedating any one or more of the cited references.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the above noted rejections. Nevertheless, in the interest of expediting allowance of the subject application and without conceding the propriety of the rejections, amendments have been made to independent claims 1, 8, and 22 herein to clarify the claimed subject matter.

### **The Claim Amendments**

In the interest of expediting allowance of the subject application and without conceding the propriety of the rejection, amendments have been made to the independent claims herein. In particular, independent claims 1, 8, and 22 have each been amended herein to clarify child window redirection techniques that include distinguishing between legacy windows and non-legacy windows. For example:

**Claim 1** as amended recites (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics) a computer-executable method, comprising:

- arranging a parent window to contain a plurality of child windows;
- providing via the arranging enhanced functionality available to the parent window through a media integration layer (MIL) component to one or more legacy windows of the contained plurality of child windows that do not natively support the enhanced functionality by, for each of the plurality of child windows:
  - determining whether the child window of the parent window is a legacy window that does not natively support the enhanced functionality, or is an MIL-aware window that natively supports the enhanced functionality;
  - when the child window is a legacy window:
    - *calling a legacy display component to perform rendering to output the child window;*
    - *causing the child window output from the legacy display component to be redirected to an off-screen buffer;*
    - retrieving the child window output from the off-screen buffer; and
    - *applying a visual enhancement to the child window output through the enhanced functionality available to the parent window through the MIL component;* and
  - when the child window is an MIL-aware window, rendering the child window directly through the MIL component; and
- composing a visual representation of the parent window having the visually enhanced child window output corresponding to each child window determined to be a legacy window.

As reflected in the preceding Amendments to the Claims, claims 8 and 22 have each been amended to incorporate similar subject matter in varying terms and scope. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification and drawings as filed. Particular attention is drawn to examples at FIG. 4 and p. 10, line 10 – p. 12 line 4. These examples describe using a MIL component of a parent window to provide enhanced functionality to legacy windows within the spirit of the amendments made to the independent claims.

As discussed in the interview on 12/18/08, Applicant submits that Gershony neither discloses nor suggests any such subject matter. In particular, Gershony applies the same techniques to both legacy and non-legacy windows. For example, Gershony describes:

5           Output from an application or other program running in a windowing environment is redirected from the application to a bit map where it can be further manipulated prior to being displayed from a display screen buffer. ***The redirection can be performed on the windows of new applications as well as existing legacy applications.*** A style bit is associated with each window from applications which are to be so redirected. By providing selected windows with redirection bit maps, performance can be enhanced by not requiring each application to regenerate portions of windows which may be uncovered during manipulation of the windows by a presentation manager. *Gershony, Summary.*

10

15

Per the above portion of Gershony, in the case of both legacy and new legacy windows, Gershony describes the same redirection as occurring. Respectfully the techniques described in Gershony are not equivalent to the claimed subject matter.

20   Gershony does not provide any basis for distinguishing between legacy and non-legacy windows and performing different operations according to the type of window. Rather, in Gershony a style bit is associated with any type of window. The style bit may be detected to cause redirection of a window (new or legacy) based on the detection. Thus, part of what Gershony lacks relative to the present claims is a determination made

25   regarding whether a window is a legacy window or non-legacy window.

Accordingly, Gershony does not provide a basis for “determining whether the child window of the parent window is a legacy window that does not natively support the

enhanced functionality, or is an MIL-aware window that natively supports the enhanced functionality” as recited in claim 1. No such determination is made in Gershony.

Moreover, as the redirection for both new and legacy windows in Gershony is the same, Gershony does not provide a basis for both a non-legacy component to handle non-legacy windows and a legacy component to handle legacy windows. Instead, Gershony describes detecting a style bit for both new and legacy windows. Thus, processing based on the style bit in Gershony occurs in the same manner for new and legacy windows alike and without regard to the type of window.

Accordingly, Gershony does not provide a basis for “when the child window is a legacy window: calling a legacy display component to perform rendering to output the child window” and “when the child window is an MIL-aware window, rendering the child window directly through the MIL component” as recited in claim 1. Gershony is silent on these aspects of the claims as presently recited.

For at least these reasons, claims 1, 8, and 22 and their associated dependent claims are not anticipated by Gershony and withdrawal of the §102 rejections is respectfully requested.

## Claim 17

Claim 17 recites an apparatus comprising:

- a processor; and
- memory storing components executable via the processor, the components including:
  - ***a user component configured to invoke a media integration layer (MIL) component*** to directly render a parent window and one or more child windows of the parent window that are MIL-aware and create an off-screen buffer upon detecting the presence of a legacy child window of the parent window;
  - ***a GDI component configured to redirect window output from the legacy child window to the off-screen buffer*** upon being notified by the user component of the existence of the legacy child window; and
  - ***the MIL component configured to retrieve the redirected window output from the off-screen buffer and apply a visual enhancement to the redirected window*** output in connection with composing the parent window for display on a display device and to directly render the one or more child windows of the parent window that are MIL-aware,
- wherein the parent window is configured to:
  - contain a plurality of child windows;
  - support enhanced functionality available through the MIL component; and
  - enable the enhanced functionality available through the MIL component to visually enhance one or more legacy child windows of the contained plurality of child windows that do not natively support the enhanced functionality of the MIL component.

For reasons discussed in the interview on 12/18/08 and above in regard to claims 1, 8, and 22, Gershony does not provide a basis for numerous features of previously presented claim 17.

For instance, Gershony lacks “detecting the presence of a legacy child window of the parent window” as recited in claim 17. Gershony further lacks “a user component configured to invoke a media integration layer (MIL) component to directly render a

parent window and one or more child windows of the parent window that are MIL-aware” and “a GDI component configured to redirect window output from the legacy child window to the off-screen buffer upon being notified by the user component of the existence of the legacy child window”. Gershony is silent on at least these aspects of the claim 17 as presently recited.

For at least these reasons, claim 17 and its associated dependent claims are not anticipated by Gershony and withdrawal of the §102 rejection is respectfully requested.

s

**Conclusion**

The Application is in condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/2/2009

By: /Daniel T. McGinnity, #55444/

Daniel T. McGinnity

Reg. No. 55444

Attorney for Applicant

Sadler, Breen, Morasch & Colby, PS

422 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 424

Spokane, Washington 99201

Telephone: (509) 755-7257

Facsimile: (509) 755-7252